

**Planning Commission Meeting  
March 21, 2000**

The San Bruno Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Tuesday, March 21, 2000 in the City Hall Council Chambers. Vice Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M. Roll call found C. Schindler, Marshall, Tobin, Petersen, present. Absent: C. Birt, Sammut. Staff present: George D. Foscardo, Community and Economic Development Director; Steve Padovan; Associate Planner; Grant Wilson, Associate Planner; Raffi Boloyan, Assistant Planner; Jonathan Lowell, City Attorney; Janet Aki, Recording Secretary. C. Tobin led the assemblage in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**1. Approval of Minutes**

M/S Schindler, Petersen to approve minutes as submitted; all ayes. Absent: C. Birt, Sammut

**2. Communications**

Mr. Foscardo announced that former Planning Commission chair, Bob Marshall, Jr., had presented the Commission's annual report to the City Council. This report also contained information on the status of the General Plan and its implementation. Since it is anticipated the revision to the General Plan will commence this year, Mr. Foscardo recommended this report be reviewed and kept as a reference for use during the General Plan update.

**3. Public Comment (Items Not on Agenda) - None**

Bill Ruggiero, San Luis Avenue, asked if there would be a public hearing regarding 160 El Camino Real at the April 4, 2000 meeting since staff is recommended the item be continued. Mr. Lowell responded the item will be opened for public hearing at this meeting with the hearing being continued to the April 4, 2000 meeting.

**4. 3531 Highland Drive (Tape File 401-A)**

**Request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of a two-story addition resulting in an increase in the gross floor area by more than 50% and a second-story front deck which is larger than 72 square feet; per Sections 12.200.030.B.1 and 12.200.040.B.3.(a) of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Use Permit 00-01 (Public Hearing) Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption Zoning: Single-Family Residential (R-1)**

Mr. Boloyan entered staff report dated March 21, 2000 into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

C. Marshall asked the distinction between a sewing room and bedroom. Mr. Boloyan responded in this case, the closet in the sewing room is small and not typical of what you would find in a bedroom. C. Petersen inquired about the condition changing the bubble skylight to a flat skylight. Mr. Boloyan responded that in the past the Architectural Review Committee had expressed concern with a bubble type design requesting the flat skylights be used. C. Schindler clarified the Committee's concerns have been the bubble type projects above the roof line and switching to a flat skylight was merely for aesthetic reasons.

C. Tobin asked the easement on the east side of the property. Mr. Boloyan explained city records show no easement and the addition is set back five feet from the property line. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the owner will be required to determine the status of the easement.

The public hearing opened. Kamil Tabib, project designer, was present. Mr. Tabib stated he could not find any data as to who owns the easement, therefore, he kept a five feet setback. As far as the sewing room, the closet was not large enough to meet the requirement for a bedroom and the owner wanted a hobby room. Concerning the bubble skylight, it makes no difference whether the light is flat or bubble. The skylight was not included in the original drawing but since the kitchen is going to be in the center of the house, he thought a skylight would provide some daylight. They have read and agree to the conditions of approval.

The hearing closed without objection.

M/S Schindler, Petersen that the San Bruno Planning Commission approve Use permit 00-01 subject to the following findings of fact and conditions; passed by the following vote:

AYES: C. Schindler, Petersen, Marshall, Tobin, Johnson  
NOES: None                      ABSENT: C. Sammut, Birt

**FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, March 11, 2000 and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on March 7, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The proposal for a two story addition will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use because the addition will blend well with the existing home as well as those surrounding and the use is consistent with the surrounding single-family residences.
6. The new second-story addition will not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the proposal is consistent with the size and scale of the surrounding Pacific Heights neighborhood, and the design, architecture, and materials will match the existing structure and minimize potential impacts to adjacent neighbors.
7. The proposal for an expanded single-family home is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.

**CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL**

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 00-01 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 00-01 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of a two-story addition resulting in an increase in the gross floor area by more than 50% and a second-story front deck which is larger than 72 square feet shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on March 21, 2000 labeled Exhibit "B," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Director of Planning and Building.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.

4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. **No** portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
6. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for revocation of this permit.
7. All drainage from the roof drains shall be directed to the City storm drain.
8. Prior to final inspection, the entire structure shall be painted in a matching color
9. All windows which are accessible from the ground (or on a balcony), must have lift out resisting hardware and secondary locks.
10. Prior to building permit submittal, the plans shall be revised to change the proposed bubble skylight to a flat skylight.
11. If none exists, a sanitary sewer clean out shall be installed at the property line.
12. There shall be **no** storage of materials of debris in the city right-of-way
13. An encroachment permit shall be required for any work in the right-of-way.

(C. Johnson advised of the seven day appeal period).

**5. 1029 San Felipe Avenue (Tape File 401-A)**

**Request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of a 302 sq.ft. bonus room behind the garage and a 707 sq.ft. addition to the main floor resulting in a floor area ratio of .63 where .55 is allowed; per Section 12.200.030.B.2 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Use Permit 00-02 (Public Hearing) Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption Zoning: Single-Family Residential (R-1)**

C. Marshall excused himself from this item due to having a business relationship with the architect.

Mr. Padovan entered staff report dated March 21, 2000 into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

C. Tobin commented when he visited the site, the owners had some concerns such as the "zig zag" on the property line, the type of lighting for the address numbers, lift out hardware on the windows, and installing a sewer clean out. Also, whether permits were issued for the bonus room.

Mr. Padovan replied the lighting of the address numbers and lift out windows are conditions from the Police Department. Also, the city requires a sewer clean out when a bath is added. There are permits on file showing a room downstairs.

The public hearing opened. Wendy and Bob Kelly, property owners, stated they purchased this home ten years ago and rather than move, decided to add on. They have read and agree to the conditions of approval.

The concern with the curb and driveway cut outs has been resolved. They propose to use the bonus room

as an office and day care.

The hearing closed without objection.

M/S Tobin, Schindler that the San Bruno Planning Commission approve Use Permit 00-02 subject to the following findings of fact and conditions; passed by the following vote:

AYES: C. Schindler, Petersen, Tobin, Johnson

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: C. Marshall

ABSENT: C. Birt, Sammut

**FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, March 11, 2000 and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on March 7, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of a 302 square foot bonus room behind the garage and a 707 square foot addition to the main floor resulting in a floor area ratio of .63 where .55 is allowed at 1029 San Felipe Avenue will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use because the addition will blend well with the existing home as well as those surrounding, there is adequate parking provided and the use is consistent with surrounding residential homes.
6. The new addition will not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the proposal is consistent with the size and scale of the surrounding neighborhood and the design, architecture, and materials will match the existing structure.
7. The proposal for an expanded single-family home is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.

**CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL**

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 00-02 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 00-02 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of a 302 square foot bonus room behind the garage and a 707 square foot addition to the main floor resulting in a floor area ratio of .63 where .55 is allowed at 1029 San Felipe Avenue shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission

on March 21, 2000 labeled Exhibit "B," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Director of Planning and Building.

3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. **No** portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
6. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for revocation of this permit.
7. All drainage from the roof drains shall be directed to the City storm drain.
8. Prior to final inspection, the windows, trim, roof material, and exterior finish and color on the addition and existing structure shall match.
9. The addition shall be painted to match the existing building
10. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
11. All windows which are accessible from the ground (or on a balcony), should have lift out resisting hardware and secondary locks.
12. Install a new sanitary sewer clean out at the property line per City requirements.
13. Remove existing driveway approach and replace per City requirements

(C. Johnson advised of the seven day appeal period).

C. Marshall returned to the podium.

**6. 879 Easton Avenue (Tape File 401-A)**

**Request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of a single family residential addition which would be greater than 50% larger than the existing residence and would have a floor area ratio of .551 where .55 is allowed; per Sections 12.200.030.B.1&2 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Use Permit 00-03 (Public Hearing) Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption Zoning: Single-Family Residential (R-1)**

Mr. Wilson entered staff report dated March 21, 2000 into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

The public hearing opened. Niall O'Neill, project designer was present. C. Marshall asked for clarification on the access to the family room stating it appears it would require going through the utility area and asked if the owner had discussed opening the wall. The current arrangement looks like a second unit. Mr. O'Neill stated the water heater and furnace are in a closet and the owner's intent is to eventually enlarge the kitchen into this utility area. C. Petersen asked if they are planning on adding another kitchen. Mr. O'Neill responded they are not.

C. Tobin pointed out there is a bath for each bedroom. Also, there are two mail boxes with addresses of 879 and 879-A Easton. Mr. O'Neill stated it was the owner's desire to have two master suites. C. Schindler stated he spoke with a young man when he visited the site and it seems there will be an extended family living in the home. C. Johnson confirmed she spoke with the owner who stated he was getting married and his brother and wife would also be living with them.

C. Johnson asked about the storage shed at the rear and if it was built with permits. It appeared the temple area in the shed was sheetrock and had lighting. Also, it appeared the garage was designed for use as living quarters. Mr. Wilson responded a permit was not required due to the small size. C. Schindler clarified the lighting was from candles.

C. Petersen asked if consideration was given to modifying the garage to make it large enough for two cars. Mr. O'Neill responded since there is such a long driveway, the owner did not seem too concerned about parking two cars in the garage.

C. Tobin stated he visited the site but had trouble getting outside to the storage shed. He feels the home is too large for the neighborhood and that it will also be used as a two family residence.

James Claussen, 878 Green Avenue, said he has lived at this address for 13 years and some one has always lived in the back storage area and questioned whether this was a legal living unit. He also asked how much of the garage space was used as living area. The proposed addition lends itself to becoming a second unit. He is not opposed to the addition but does not want the site to have two units. C. Schindler commented he feels no one lives in the front part of the garage and this was confirmed by the person he spoke with when he visited the site.

Mr. Lowell clarified that if it is determined there is an illegal unit on the site, the city will first contact the owner requesting it be removed and if this is not done, enforcement proceedings would commence. A condition could be imposed that a building permit would not be issued until the illegal unit is removed.

The public hearing closed without objection.

C. Petersen asked if staff had discussion with the owner about the garage not being the usual size for two cars. Mr. Wilson stated 20 feet is the standard and this is 18" short of that which is not uncommon.

C. Tobin pointed out the addition would basically eliminate the rear yard. C. Petersen commented the size is well below the maximum coverage, the floor area ratio is small compared to some other applications, the access to the family room through the utility area is unusual. There is nothing to prevent the owner from renting bedrooms.

M/S Petersen, Marshall that the San Bruno Planning Commission approve Use Permit 00-03 subject to the following findings of fact and conditions; passed by the following vote:

AYES: C. Petersen, Marshall, Schindler, Johnson

NOES: C. Tobin                      ABSENT: C. Sammut, Birt

#### **FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, March 11, 2000, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on March 7, 2000.

2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter

12.132.

3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.

4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.

5. The use permit request to construct a 1304 square foot addition to the single-family home at 879 Easton Avenue will not be injurious or detrimental to the property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the addition complies with all setback, height, and lot coverage requirements of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance.

6. The general appearance of the residential addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the architectural design and materials will match the existing structure as closely as possible.

7. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other property in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.

8. The construction of the addition to the existing residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.

**CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL**

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, UP-00-03 shall not be valid for any purpose. UP-00-03 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.

2. The proposed addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on March 21, 2000 labeled Exhibit "A," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Director of Planning and Building.

3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.

4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.

5. Install new sanitary sewer clean-out at property line per City standard.

6. The residence, garage, and addition shall be used only as a single family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.

7. Address numbers must be at least four inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.

8. Sliding doors and windows which are accessible from the ground (or on a balcony) must have lift out resisting hardware and secondary locks.

9. Exterior entry doors (including pedestrian garage entry door) on the house are to be metal or 1-3/4" solid core wood with a deadbolt lock with a bolt throw of at least one inch. The front door must have a 190 degree peep viewer unless there are vision panels in or around the door.
10. Any windows in or adjacent to the front door and within reach (40") of the door locking device are to have burglary resistant glazing or be equivalently resistant.
11. If any French doors are installed, the inactive leaf must have floor and ceiling extension bolts of at least 3/4" throw.
12. The addition shall use exterior building materials which are compatible with the existing residence as indicated on the plans.
13. The designer shall ensure that the existing water service is sufficient for the new addition. Submit hydraulic calculation to the City of San Bruno Public Works Department for review if uprising is necessary.
14. The homeowner shall ensure that the existing sewer service is adequate to handle the additional bathrooms as planned.
15. The garage shall be used for the storage of vehicles. No part of the garage shall be used as living space.
16. All utilities to the storage/garden shed shall be made inoperable.
17. Any illegal units on the premises shall be vacated prior to issuance of a building permit.
18. The washer and dryer shall be moved to a new location and the wall between the existing utility room and family room shall be removed.

(C. Johnson advised of the seven day appeal period).

**7. 160 El Camino Real (Tape File 401-A)**

**Revised request for a Conditional Use Permit, Architectural Review Permit, and Parking Exception to allow construction of a 960 square foot convenience mart within an existing retail building and new gas pump canopy on the site of a former gas station and existing carpet store per Sections 12.96.110.C.6, 12.108.010.A, and 12.100.090 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Architectural Review Permit 00-01, Parking Exception 00-01, Use Permit 00-04(Public Hearing) Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption Zoning: General Commercial (C-1)**

The public hearing opened and M/S Marshall, Tobin to continue to April 4, 2000; all ayes. Absent: C. Birt, Sammut

**8. 205 Angus Avenue West (Tape File 401-A, B 402-A)**

**Request for a Zone Text Amendment to amend Section 12.96.120.C.4 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow club and lodge facilities in the 200 block of Angus Avenue West as a conditional use and a Use Permit, Architectural Review Permit and Parking Exception for a 3,473 sq.ft. addition to an existing single story commercial building resulting in an 8,291 sq.ft. building with an exterior alteration visible from the public right-of-way and includes a 44 space parking exception; per Chapters 12.108, 12.112 and 12.136 and Sections 12.96.120. C.4, 12.100.090 and 12.100.120 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Zone Change 00-01, Parking Exception 00-02 Architectural Review Permit 00-02, and Use Permit 00-05 (Public Hearing) Environmental Determination: Negative Declaration (Public Hearing) Zoning: Central Business District (C-B-D)**

Mr. Padovan entered staff report dated March 21, 2000 into the record. A digital photo presentation was



provided.

The public hearing opened. Ron Cox, project manager, was present. Mr. Cox presented historical information regarding an agreement between Artichoke Joe's and BART wherein BART was to do construction work in phases, leaving 160 parking spaces on Huntington Avenue at all times. The estimated construction period was 18 months. In order to get more customer parking, they purchased the adjacent lodge next door and propose to place parking in that area. This necessitated relocating the lodge. BART will shut down Huntington Avenue from Posey Park to Angus Avenue for 4-1/2 months now rather than 18. Artichoke Joe's has entered into a tentative agreement with the City and Tanforan Park Shopping Center to use a section of their parking structure, for employee parking, during the construction period. This offer will be extended to the downtown merchants and transportation will be provided to and from the downtown area. Some of the merchants stated their employees were not interested in a shuttle service and want to continue parking behind the store buildings.

Regarding the conditions of approval (10, 11, 12), they will install additional exits and fire sprinklers if required by the building and fire codes; #13 - there may be one or two occasions per year where they would meet over a three day period. There are about 50 members who meet on Monday and Tuesday evenings. The current lodge contains about 5600 sq. ft. and the new location would have about 8300 sq. ft. This would allow approximately 477 occupants. C. Marshall expressed concern over the small trash enclosure particularly if food is served and also whether the building would be rented for private parties. Mr. Cox stated there is no kitchen, only a warming area. They do not plan to rent the building. In response to C. Tobin, Mr. Cox advised the driveway is 14 feet wide.

Russ Byers, 579 San Mateo Avenue, this use will have a parking impact on San Mateo Avenue and this could be worse if the building is sold for restaurant use. Mr. Padovan stated if the building is sold and used entirely as a restaurant use, a parking exception would also be required. Mr. Byers asked if the 18 parking spaces would be public or private. The City just adopted a Redevelopment Plan and it would be hard to justify extending the parking lot if a building was recently constructed. The idea of removing the old building to provide more parking for Artichoke Joe's and relocating the temple to Angus Avenue could be accomplished without enlarging the structure.

Bruce Moore, 568 San Mateo Avenue, stated this will impact the parking lot behind his shop. There were 12 spaces formerly used by the Grand Leader Market. Removing this parking is something that will be regretted for a long time and the plan should be modified to save some of that parking. If the proposed building was reduced by 15 feet, they could regain those 12 spaces. Should probably also remove the driveway if the parking is removed. Mr. Moore asked if more buildings would be removed.

Mr. Cox stated the 12 parking spaces were private. Two buildings have been razed and they will raze two more which should give them adequate on-site parking.

Ed Simon, 465 San Mateo Avenue, stated the proposed use is basically an existing use moving from the 600 block of San Mateo Avenue to Angus Avenue. Artichoke Joe's has done a good job by arranging employee parking at Tanforan. The merchants in the 500 block will have to develop a plan for employee parking. He would not like to use redevelopment to acquire these buildings but perhaps consider double decking the existing city parking lots.

Mike Gilrich, property owner at 628 San Mateo Avenue, said they should not remove parking in this area. Most of those property owners have paid for a part of the parking lots at the rear of their businesses.

Mr. Foscardo explained that when the parking assessment district was created for the 600 block of San Mateo Avenue, the major contributor to the 29 space lot was Artichoke Joe's. Additionally, the number of on street parking spaces on Angus Avenue have increased. The parking lot that will replace the building on San Mateo Avenue is private; no one in the 500 block paid for those spaces. Several years ago, practically any use was allowed on San Mateo Avenue without obtaining a parking exception under the premise there

**Planning Commission Meeting  
March 21, 2000 - Page 10**

was public parking in the city lots. This policy was amended whereas higher intensity uses now require parking exceptions. Also, the merchants should require their employees to park the farthest and save the closest spaces for the customers. There are several concerns that are germane to the downtown area and C. Sammut is the Planning Commission representative to the CBD Committee and perhaps they need a meeting to review these issues.

The public hearing closed without objection.

C. Schindler pointed out the lodge now has a meeting twice a week for about 50 members and questioned why they are relocating to a facility almost twice as large. Mr. Cox responded there are two separate areas in the proposed building; one for worship and the other for eating. At the current location, they are required to eat in three shifts and moving to a larger building will allow them to eat and worship together.

C. Marshall asked if there were plans to remodel the San Mateo Avenue side of Artichoke Joe's. Mr. Cox said plans have been submitted to the city for the parking area. C. Petersen inquired about the non-conforming sign on the building. Mr. Cox said they propose to tear that building down. C. Petersen asked why this would not be considered spot zoning. Mr. Foscardo responded the site is not being rezoned just adding lodges and clubs as allowable uses. C. Petersen agreed that a parking problem could exist if the property is sold to a higher intensity use. It appears the structure will be fairly costly and yet used on a limited basis. Mr. Cox explained Artichoke Joe's has paid escalated prices for years for properties in that block in order to obtain parking. The Commission could actually have a condition of approval that if the property is sold, a use permit would be required for any operation. Mr. Padovan added that if a restaurant were to go in, and they used the entire building, that would require a higher parking demand. The proposed site has always been used for some type of office or storage facility.

C. Tobin said it appears the use will be a church yet the text amendment will be for lodges and clubs. As far as the conditions of approval, the Fire Department put these in for a reason; double decking the parking lots seems like a must; changing the hours for group gatherings, would allow the members to use the facility for various events, i.e. weddings; the voters approved Artichoke Joe's request for a three story parking structure.

C. Marshall concurred that most employees park directly behind the stores and take up most of the parking. Also, by moving to such a larger building, the number of members could increase. The building should be scaled back. He would like to see a larger trash area as well as having garbage picked up the day after an event.

M/S Petersen, Schindler that the Planning Commission adopt the negative Declaration and approve Zone Change 00-01, Use Permit 00-05, Architectural Review Permit 00-02, and Parking Exception 00-02 subject to the following findings of fact and conditions; passed by the following vote:

AYES: C. Petersen, Schindler, Tobin, Marshall, Johnson  
NOES: None                      ABSENT: C. Sammut, Birt

**FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, February 26, 2000, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the site on February 25, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the

**Planning Commission Meeting  
March 21, 2000 - Page 11**

San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.

4. The Zone Text Amendment to amend Section 12.96.120.C.4 of the Central Business District (C-B-D) to allow for the inclusion of lodges and clubs in the 200 block of West Angus Avenue as conditionally permitted uses is consistent with the City's General Plan Land Use Element. Lodges and clubs typically serve a more local customer base which is consistent with the Neighborhood/Community Commercial designation in the General Plan and their inclusion in the designation is consistent with the uses currently allowed in an adjacent section of downtown with the same designation

5. The Zone Text Change is consistent with the City's Zoning Ordinance which provides for zoning text amendments and is consistent with the types of uses that are existing in the 600 block of San Mateo Avenue in the same zone. Lodges/clubs typically serve a more local customer base and are currently allowed as conditional uses in the 600 block of San Mateo Avenue which is directly adjacent to the 200 block of West Angus Avenue.

6. A Negative Declaration was prepared for the project in accordance with the provisions of CEQA, as amended. It was determined that no significant impacts would result from the proposal.

7. The Zone Text Amendment to amend Section 12.96.120.C.4 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow club and lodge facilities on the 200 block of Angus Avenue West as a conditional use and a Use Permit, Architectural Review Permit and Parking Exception for a 3,473 sq.ft. addition to an existing single story commercial building resulting in an 8,291 sq.ft. lodge/club which is visible from the public right-of-way and includes a 44 space parking exception at 205 West Angus Avenue will not be adverse to the public health, safety or general welfare of the community nor detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements. The use as proposed conforms to the existing nature of the C-B-D zone district and there are similar commercial uses existing directly adjacent to the 200 block of West Angus. Any adverse impacts can be mitigated through alterations in the architectural design and through conditions of approval. The text amendment will provide the property owners with additional flexibility in the development and leasing of the area and allow the City to approve uses that are compatible with existing development.

8. The strict application of the provisions of this chapter would cause particular difficulty or undue hardship in connection with the use and enjoyment of said property. The 44 space parking exception is justified by the fact that the proposed lodge/club use will be replacing a similar sized use on the 600 block of San Mateo Avenue which will be demolished and replaced by an 18 space parking lot. Therefore, this proposal actually increases the amount of parking downtown because the users at the previous site will be relocated to an underutilized public lot and on-street parking in the 600 block of San Mateo will be available for other commercial users including added parking for the casino.

9. The establishment, maintenance and/or conducting of the off-street parking facilities as proposed are as nearly in compliance with the requirements set forth in this chapter as are reasonably possible. This project proposes to utilize public parking lots and street parking for their use. These public lots were specifically created for the use of all properties in downtown due to the original design of the downtown which consists of small lots with high percentages of lot cover and no parking provided. The limited use and hours of the facility will have only a minimal impact on the availability of parking in the immediate area.

10. This project is in conformance with the San Bruno Redevelopment Project Area, dated July 1999. The installation of this use will not interfere with any future plans for the redevelopment of downtown San Bruno.

11. This project complies with the Cost to Cure agreement between the City of San Bruno and BART which was entered into to allow for the construction of the BART subway through the City more efficiently and to reduce construction impacts on downtown businesses. This agreement required that BART compensate Artichoke Joe's for lost parking and that replacement parking be provided to replace those lost on Huntington Avenue. This project evolved from this agreement as the relocation of the existing hall and

the subsequent demolition of the building on San Mateo Avenue will allow for the creation of a 40 space parking lot to replace the lost parking during the BART construction.

**CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL**

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is file, Use Permit (UP-00-05), Architectural Review Permit (AR-00-02) and Parking Exception (PE-00-02) shall not be valid for any purpose. The Use Permit, Architectural Review Permit and Parking Exception shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
3. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
4. The proposed Zone Text Amendment to amend Section 12.96.120.C.4 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow club and lodge facilities on the 200 block of Angus Avenue West as a conditional use and a Use Permit, Architectural Review Permit and Parking Exception for a 3,473 sq.ft. addition to an existing single story commercial building resulting in an 8,291 sq.ft. lodge/club which is visible from the public right-of-way and includes a 44 space parking exception at 205 West Angus Avenue shall be built according to the plans, staff report and other materials approved by the Planning Commission on March 21, 2000 labeled Exhibit "B", except as required to be modified by these conditions of approval. Any modification to the approved plans and colors shall require prior review and approval by the Architectural Review Committee.
5. All lighting fixtures on the building shall direct light downward and shall be equipped with shades to focus lighting onto the parking area, not onto adjacent properties.
6. The landscape planters along West Angus Avenue shall be planted with appropriate flowering plants and small shrubs and shall be maintained and kept litter free.
7. The future tenant shall apply to the Planning Department for a sign permit. Signage shall be limited to one wall sign on each street frontage and directional signage over doorways. No pole or roof signage shall be permitted.
8. All roof equipment shall be screened using materials matching the building's exterior and colors.
9. Showers shall be made handicap accessible.
10. Two exits shall be provided from the multi-purpose room and one additional exit shall be provided from the worship room.
11. Provide a fire sprinkler system according to N.F.P.A. 13, U.F.C. 1998 and San Bruno Fire Sprinkler Ordinance.
12. San Bruno Fire Department requires that all bathrooms, closets and pantries be fire sprinkled. Submit fire sprinkler plans to San Bruno Fire Department for approval.
13. The lodge hours of operation for group gatherings are limited to Monday and Tuesday nights from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. The hall may not be rented out to non-member uses.
14. Any proposed change in operations shall require review by the Planning Commission to determine parking impacts and mitigation measures if any

15. The applicant/developer shall comply with "Best Management Practices" for all grading and construction activities.
16. Construction noise and operations shall comply with existing San Bruno Ordinances. Demolition and mass grading activities shall be limited to Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
17. The applicant shall comply with the following Public Works Department conditions of approval and "Commercial Building Permit Application Requirements":
  - a. Repair and replace broken curb, gutter and sidewalk on West Angus Avenue and Mastick Avenue. Remove all driveway approaches not in use and replace with new sidewalk, curb and gutter to City standards.
  - b. Show building and parking lot drainage. All roof drainage shall be diverted to an under curb drain to the City storm drain system.
  - c. Submit hydraulic calculations for water and sewer services. See "Commercial Building Permit Application Requirements" below for more information. Submit utility plan showing location and profile for all utilities and details of connection to the City main. Install an adequately sized sewer lateral.
  - d. Obtain an encroachment permit from the City for any work to be performed on the City right-of-way.
  - e. Provide a sanitary sewer cleanout at the edge of the property line.
  - f. Resurface the new driveway on the west side of the subject property and mark the pavement and provide signage indicating one way entry access only.

**COMMERCIAL BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS  
RELATED ITEMS**

The following items are to be shown on the plans or in the specifications.

Domestic and Irrigation Water Services

1. Maximum and Minimum flows in fixture units and g.p.m. for each meter. Minimum flow is typically defined as lowest demand fixture operating alone for domestic. For irrigation, minimum flows must take into account drip systems.
2. Size and location of each meter.
3. \*Size and location of service line.
4. Location and details of backflow device. Backflow devices will be required for all non-residential applications. In the case of remodels, a backflow device will be required when any plumbing work is planned.

Fire Sprinkler Supply Line

1. Location and details of backflow device.
2. \*Size and location of tap.
3. Material specifications and construction details for entire system up to building line.

Wastewater Service

1. Location and size of City Cleanout. Show City Cleanout details.
2. \*Plan and profile of lateral from City Cleanout to main.
3. \*Details of connection to main.

Street improvements within the Public Right-of-Way

1. Show location and details for all new work within the right-of-way. Degree of details required will vary depending on the complexity of the project.
2. Use City standard detail #8 for commercial driveways.
3. Remove and replace any cracked/settled sidewalk, curb and gutter.
4. Red curb within five feet of the driveway entrance.

The items listed above are a minimum requirements, only. Additional requirements may be imposed on a case by case basis.

All of the above work items require a City of San Bruno Encroachment Permit. Encroachment Permit applications can be obtained at the Public Works Department adjacent to the Building and Planning Department. Encroachment Permits must be issued prior to issuance of related Building Permits. Construction run-offs during August through April shall be managed utilizing guidelines delineated in "California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks."

\* These items will not need to be shown if they are existing and will not be altered.

18. The applicant shall comply with the following Police Department conditions of approval:
  - a. Address numbers, at least 8" in height, shall be mounted on a contrasting background, easily visible from the street and lighted during the hours of darkness.
  - b. If there are any sliding windows which are accessible from the ground they must have lift-out resisting hardware and secondary locks.
  - c. Exterior entry doors on the building are to be metal or 1 3/4" solid core wood with a dead bolt lock with a bolt throw of at least 1".
  - d. Any door glass or windows in or adjacent to the exterior doors and within reach (40") of the door locking device are to have burglary resistant glazing or be equivalently resistant.
  - e. The applicant should consider installing an off-site monitored burglary and robbery alarm system.
19. The final color scheme for the building shall be reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee prior to issuance of Building Permits.

C. Petersen introduced for adoption Resolution No. 2000-01 recommending the City Council approve Zone Text Amendment 00-01. Roll call vote found all in favor.

This item will go before the City Council on April 11, 2000.

**9. Specific Plan Study Session (Tape File 402-A)**

**Environmental Determination: Environmental Impact Report Zoning: Administrative Research (A-R) Neighborhood Commercial (C-N) High Density Residential (R-4) Open Space (O) (Public Comment)**

Mr. Padovan stated a quorum was not present at the last committee meeting, however, there was some discussion regarding the level of senior activities. Additionally, Dr. Russo provided an alternative land use plan. The next meeting will be April 6, 2000.

Regarding the committee in general, they have requested their meetings be noticed on CATV and how members are to be replaced. C. Tobin suggested the members be replaced by those who originally submitted applications but were not appointed. Mr. Foscardo stated the committee formation was predicated on having adjacent property owners on the committee and if members are appointed at large there will not

be full representation from the owners. C. Marshall stated one problem is that a lot of the members do not live in the city and suggested the meetings could be held during the day. C. Petersen suggested the members be polled as to the reason they can't make the meeting. It was the consensus of the Commission to let the committee remain at 12 members if a replacement cannot be found.

**10. City Staff Discussion**

Mr. Foscardo announced the next Planning Commission meeting would be April 4, 2000.

**11. Planning Commission Discussion**

C. Tobin commented on his attendance at the U.C. Davis "Role of the Planning Commissioner" seminar and how informative it had been particularly regarding smart growth.

**12. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M. by motion made and passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

George D. Foscardo  
Planning Commission Secretary

Janet Aki, Recording Secretary